

REMARKS

Claims 20-36 are pending.

Claim 23 and 34 are objected to.

Claims 21, 22, 24-29, and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 20-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Morris (US 5,369,042).

Changes in the Drawings:

The drawings have been amended in response to the Examiner's request for the purpose of overcoming the Examiner's objection. Specifically, FIG. 3 has been amended to show the claimed features of the invention, specifically, the metal layer (10) at the conductive interface and the conductive bonding materials.

Support for the changes to FIG. 3 derives from applicant's disclosure, and specifically the paragraph at page 14, line 21 of the specification. Applicant therefore requests that the objection to the Drawings be withdrawn.

No new matter has been added. Approval of the corrections is respectfully requested.

Changes in the Specification:

The specification has been amended for the purpose of improving the readability of the application and are of a clerical, typographical or grammatical nature. No new matter has been added.

The specification has been amended by replacing the paragraph starting at page 14, line 21 to better conform the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added.

Changes in the Claims:

Claims 20-26, 28, 32-34 have been amended in this application to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendment to claim 20 may be found at page 11, lines 19-22: “the thin layer **can be integral** with a support through the use of an intermediate conductive interface so as to allow electrical connection between these two elements.”

Objections to claims 23 and 34:

Claim 23 is objected to because “characterized” is misspelled in line 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that “characterized” is correctly spelled.

Claim 34 is objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 28. Applicant accordingly has amended claim 28.

Applicant therefore requests that the above objections be removed.

Rejection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph – claims 21, 22, 24-29, and 32-36

Claims 21, 22, 24-29, and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP §2171 identifies two separate requirements: (1) the claims must set forth the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention; and (2) the claims must particularly point out and distinctly define the meets and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant. A lack of antecedent basis may be found if a claim is “indefinite” because “it contains words or phrases whose meaning is unclear”; see MPEP §2173.05(e).

The Office Action alleges that the term “multitude of zones” in claim 21 is indefinite. Claim 21 has been amended to replace “multitude of zones” with “multitude of said zones” and “said multitude of zones”.

The Office Action alleges that the term “one zone or a plurality of zones” in claim 22 is indefinite. Claim 22 has been amended to replace “one zone or a plurality of zones” with “one of said zones or a plurality of said zones.”

The Office Action alleges that the limitation “the conductive interface” in claim 24 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 24 has been amended to replace “the conductive interface” with “said intermediate conductive interface”.

The Office Action alleges that the limitation “said metal interface layer” in claim 26 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 26 has been amended to replace “said metal interface layer” with “said intermediate conductive interface”.

The Office Action alleges that the limitation “said metal interface layer” in claim 33 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 33 has been amended to replace “said metal interface layer” with “said intermediate conductive interface”.

Applicant submits that the claims now meet the statutory requirements.

Rejection under 35 USC §102(b) – claims 20-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36

Claims 20-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Morris (US 5,369,042). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim must be anticipated for a proper rejection under §102(a), (b), and (e). This requirement is satisfied “only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”; see MPEP §2131 and *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A rejection under §102(b) may be overcome by showing that the claims are patentably distinguishable from the prior art; see MPEP §706.02(b).

Morris teaches a method for forming a bipolar transistor. The transistor taught in Morris (see Fig. 2e) includes portions of different layers of different doping N- and N+. Morris teaches a semi-insulating substrate 50 onto which a subcollector 52 and a layer 54 are grown. Thus, the semi-insulating substrate 50 is **not integral** with the subcollector 52 and the layer 54.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention claims a thin layer **integral** with a support and each zone electrically connects the support to a face of the thin layer opposite to the support. (see claim 20). Morris does not teach or suggest “**a thin layer integral**

with a support” and each zone electrically connects the support to a face of the thin layer opposite to the support (see claim 20).

The presently claimed invention is, accordingly, distinguishable over the cited reference. In the view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that claim 20 is now in condition for allowance.

Rejection of claims 21-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36

Claims 21-23, 26, 28-32, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the amended claims are now in proper form, and that the amended claims all define patentable subject matter over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Request for allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is

earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP

Dated: June 24 2003



Thierry K. Lo
Reg. No. 49,097

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 282-1810 Direct
(408) 292-5800 Main
(408) 278-8210 Fax